

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Claim Amendments**

The Applicant has amended claims 5, 8, 13, 16 and 18. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### **Examiner Objections - Claims**

Examiner has advised that should claim 2 be found allowable, claim 18 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. The Applicant notes that claim 18 should depend from claim 17 and claim 18 was amended to properly depend from claim 17.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC 112**

Claims 5, 8, 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the term "related" is not clear and the amendments to the subject claims were made in order to more clearly and distinctly claim the invention to which the Applicant is entitled. In paragraph 0019 of the specification, Background of the present invention, the Applicant describes a condition of one or more related TCAP messages being sent as part of a TCAP transaction between two signaling points. Figure 7 of the drawings illustrates one embodiment of a process of setting up a TCAP transaction. The decision of whether to set up a new SCCP connection or use an already established SCCP connection is based "in part on whether the same two signaling points, Node A and Node B, are involved in the TCAP transactions" (para. 0053). As noted in the Background of the Specification, the term "related" refers to TCAP messages being sent between two signaling points. And, the TCAP messages are "related" to the same SCCP entity.

### **Allowable Subject Matter**

The Applicant gratefully acknowledges the allowance of claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-12, 14-15, 17, 19 and 20 and the conditional allowance of claims 5, 8, 13 and 16. As the Examiner has suggested, claims 5, 8, 13 and 16 have been rewritten in order to overcome the Examiner's objections. Consequently, the Applicant believes claims 5, 8, 13 and 16 are also in a condition of allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 8, 13, 16 and 18.

### **Prior Art Not Relied Upon**

In paragraph 6 on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Sidney L. Weatherford". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first and last names being more prominent.

By Sidney L. Weatherford  
Registration No. 45,602

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656  
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com